

## REMARKS

In the Examiner's Amendment attached to the Notice of Allowability, claims 17-20 were canceled as being drawn to a **non-elected invention**. However, the Response submitted on February 25, 2005, points out that **claims 17-20 read on** (and are generic to) **the elected species**. Therefore, claims 17-20 should not have been canceled.

It is true that claims 17-20 were erroneously indicated as "withdrawn" in the Response submitted on June 1, 2005. This was clearly an error since, in the Official Action of March 18, 2005, the Examiner agreed that only claims 1-4, 7-9, and 13 should be withdrawn.

Since claims 17-20 have been erroneously canceled by Examiner's Amendment, they are presented above as new claims 23-26. **New claims 23-26 are identical to original claims 17-20.** The claims have not otherwise been amended.

The introduction of erroneously canceled claims does not raise new issues since the re-introduced claims are dependent from allowed claims, and were examined on the merits in the first Official Action, the rejection thereof having been overcome in the June 1, 2005 response.

For the above reasons, entry of the amendments to the specification in accordance with prescribed procedures is requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



BENJAMIN E. URCIA  
Registration No. 33,805

Date: August 1, 2005

BACON & THOMAS  
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Telephone: (703) 683-0500

NWB:S:\Producer\beu\Pending A...HJNHORN677219\312Aamend.wpd